

Instabilities in the nonsymmetric theory of gravitation

Tomas Janssen* and Tomislav Prokopec†

Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Utrecht Leuvenlaan 4,

Postbus 80.195, 3508 TD Utrecht, The Netherlands

We consider the linearized nonsymmetric theory of gravitation (NGT) within the background of an expanding universe and near a Schwarzschild metric. We show that the theory always develops instabilities unless the linearized nonsymmetric lagrangian reduces to a particular simple form. This theory contains a gauge invariant kinetic term, a mass term for the antisymmetric metric-field and a coupling with the Ricci curvature scalar. This form cannot be obtained within NGT. Next we discuss NGT beyond linearized level and conjecture that the instabilities are not a relic of the linearization, but are a general feature of the full theory. Finally we show that one cannot add *ad-hoc* constraints to remove the instabilities as is possible with the instabilities found in NGT by Clayton.

I. INTRODUCTION

So far, Einstein's general relativity (GR) has stood all direct experimental tests. The precession of the perihelium of Mercury, gravitational lensing and the redshift of light are measured in agreement with the theory at the percent level, just to mention a few. The crown on this experimental evidence, a direct measurement of gravitational waves, is expected within a few years [1].

However there are also reasons to try to extend GR. For example the mysterious nature of dark energy and dark matter might become resolved within a modified theory of gravity. The standard example of a modified theory of gravity is Milgrom's Modified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND) [2], according to which Newton's law gets modified at very low accelerations, presenting an alternative to dark matter. MOND has recently been covariantized by Bekenstein [3].

* T.Janssen2@phys.uu.nl

† T.Prokopec@phys.uu.nl

Another reason to try to extend GR is the notion of generality. Within the framework of GR torsion is not included in a natural, geometric way. Within standard GR, any calculation of the connection (either by requiring metric compatibility, or by using the first order formalism) leads to the (symmetric) Levi-Civita connection. Of course one is then free to add torsion, but there is no way that torsion follows naturally from the theory. An interesting generalization of GR would generate torsion in a purely geometric way, analogous to the way the Levi-Civita connection is generated in GR.

The Nonsymmetric Gravitational Theory (NGT) [4] is an extension of GR that drops the standard axiom of GR that the metric is a symmetric tensor. Therefore we write the general, nonsymmetric metric as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = G_{\mu\nu} + B_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu} = g_{(\mu\nu)}$, $B_{\mu\nu} = g_{[\mu\nu]}$ and $(\cdot)$ and $[\cdot]$ indicate normalized symmetrization and antisymmetrization, respectively, as defined in Eq. (A1). Indeed there is no physical principle that tells us that the metric should be symmetric and therefore such a generalization is very interesting to study. These kinds of theories were originally studied by Einstein [5] [6] in an attempt to unify GR with Maxwell's theory. However it turned out to be impossible to regain the Lorentz force law [7] [8]. The theory was revived by Moffat [9], but now with the interpretation that the antisymmetric part of the metric really produces a new gravity-like force. This extra structure produces interesting results on the issues of dark energy and dark matter [10] [11] [12]. It will be clear that such a theory produces torsion in a very natural way. Furthermore note that a dynamical nonsymmetric metric field also naturally arises from non-linear σ -models of string theory [13]. Unfortunately the nonsymmetric theory of gravitation suffers from all kinds of problems. The first of these is the notion of non-uniqueness. Because of the extra structure in NGT, there is no natural choice for the lagrangian. Without a guiding principle, the most general lagrangian that one can write down (with up to two time derivatives) has 9 extra terms apart from the usual Ricci scalar term (see Eq. (A8)). Non-uniqueness also comes in another way: if we consider the expansion of the theory in terms of the B -field, we could in general write

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu} &= G_{\mu\nu} + B_{\mu\nu} + \rho B_{\mu\alpha} B^{\alpha}_{\nu} + \sigma B^2 G_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(B^3) \\ g^{\mu\nu} &= G^{\mu\nu} + B^{\mu\nu} + (1 - \rho) B^{\mu\alpha} B_{\alpha}^{\nu} + \sigma B^2 G^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(B^3), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $B^2 = G^{\mu\alpha} G^{\nu\beta} B_{\mu\nu} B_{\alpha\beta}$ and $B_{\alpha}^{\nu} = G^{\rho\nu} B_{\alpha\rho}$. ρ and σ are undetermined parameters. The inverse is defined by $g^{\mu\alpha} g_{\mu\beta} = \delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}$. With these two extra parameters one sees that the

linearized lagrangian is determined by 11 undetermined parameters coming from the full theory and the decomposition of the metric tensor (2).

Another problem with NGT, found by Damour, Deser and McCarthy [14], is the absence of gauge invariance

$$B_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow B_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \lambda_\nu - \partial_\nu \lambda_\mu \quad (3)$$

for the B -field. This absence occurs, since in the linearized expansion one obtains, apart from the gauge invariant kinetic term

$$-\frac{1}{12}H^2 \quad ; \quad H_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \partial_\alpha B_{\beta\gamma} + \partial_\beta B_{\gamma\alpha} + \partial_\gamma B_{\alpha\beta} \quad (4)$$

also undifferentiated powers of B that couple to the background curvature. The absence of gauge invariance might lead to the propagation of ghosts, or unacceptable constraints on dynamical degrees of freedom. Fortunately these problems can be relatively easily solved by the introduction of a mass term for the B -field [4] [15].

The final problem we discuss was found by Clayton [16]. One can show that, if one starts with a GR configuration and a small B -field, the B -field will quickly grow and therefore the linearization of the B -field does not make much sense. Since the field equations for the symmetric and antisymmetric part of the metric decouple at linearized level, Clayton argues that the instabilities might be a property of the linearized theory only. At higher orders, the B -field backreacts on the symmetric metric and therefore the GR background should be considered as evolving. Such an evolving background leads to an increase of the degrees of freedom of the B -field [17] and these extra degrees of freedom then might stabilize the field. Another (phenomenological) solution to these instabilities is given by Moffat [18]. The idea of this solution is to introduce an extra Lagrange multiplier in order that the unstable modes dynamically vanish.

For the moment forgetting Clayton's result, in this paper we consider NGT linearized around a GR configuration. By explicitly constructing two different backgrounds (FLRW-universe in section III, and Schwarzschild metric in section IV) we show that the evolution of the B -field is indeed unstable. By considering the most general form of the linearized lagrangian, we can explicitly point out which terms cause these instabilities. After having shown this we argue in section V C that instabilities are also present beyond linear level. Therefore our results can be extended to the full theory and should not be seen as a relic of the linearized theory. If these arguments are correct we must then conclude that even full, nonlinearized NGT suffers from instabilities. Finally we show in section V D that the

dynamical solution of Moffat to solve the instabilities found by Clayton does not solve the instabilities we find.

In section II we briefly summarize the linearized theory, in sections III and IV we evaluate the evolution of the B -field in two different GR backgrounds. In section V we analyze the results, discuss the theory beyond linear level and consider dynamically constrained NGT. In section VI we draw our conclusions. In appendix A we state our notation and give the derivation of the linearized lagrangian. Appendix B summarizes the geometric quantities needed in the text.

II. THE LINEARIZED LAGRANGIAN

Since GR is very successful, it is natural to assume that any modification of the theory should be relatively small. Therefore we consider NGT in the limit of a small B , but an arbitrary G . The linearized Lagrangian of such a theory will in general have the following form (see Appendix A):

$$\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-G} \left[R + 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{12}H^2 + \left(\frac{1}{4}m^2 + \beta R\right)B^2 - \alpha R_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\alpha}B_{\alpha}{}^{\nu} - \gamma R_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta}B^{\mu\nu}B^{\alpha\beta} \right] + \mathcal{O}(B^3). \quad (5)$$

Here the curvature terms $R_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta}$, $R_{\mu\nu}$ and R all refer to the background, GR, curvature. The coefficient γ is determined by the particular choice of the 'full' lagrangian, β is determined by the decomposition of the metric (2), while α depends both on the full lagrangian and the decomposition. Naturally, different choices of these coefficients lead to different physical theories, so though in principle we can always make a decomposition of the metric in such a way that α and β vanish, we have no guiding principle that tells us they *must* be zero and therefore we will keep them arbitrary. The coefficient γ cannot be set to zero within the first order (Palatini) formalism (see appendix A). Since the curvature couplings break the gauge invariance (3), the mass m^2 has been added to prevent ghost modes to propagate [14]. This is not as artificial as it may sound. A mass is natural, since it is automatically generated in the presence of a nonzero cosmological constant (see Eq. (A23)). We may assume that the mass term is generated by a cosmological constant and therefore we have today,

$$m^2 \sim \Lambda \leq 10^{-84} \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (6)$$

Note that this inequality is not necessarily true at all times, especially not when one considers an epoch of the early Universe, since the cosmological term may change during the evolution

TABLE I: The scale factor and conformal time in different eras

era	a	η
de Sitter inflation	$a = -\frac{1}{H_I \eta}$	$\eta \leq -\frac{1}{H_I}$
Radiation	$a = H_I \eta$	$\frac{1}{H_I} \leq \eta \leq \eta_e$
Matter	$a = \frac{H_I}{4\eta_e^2}(\eta + \eta_e)^2$	$\eta \geq \eta_e$

of the Universe (for example during phase transitions). The field equations derived from the lagrangian (5) are

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\sqrt{-G})^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho (\sqrt{-G} H^{\rho\mu\nu}) + (\frac{1}{2} m^2 + 2\beta R) B^{\mu\nu} \\
& - \alpha (B^{\nu\alpha} R^\mu{}_\alpha + B^{\alpha\mu} R^\nu{}_\alpha) - 2\gamma B^{\alpha\beta} R^\mu{}_\alpha{}^\nu{}_\beta + \mathcal{O}(B^2) = 0 \\
& R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R G_{\mu\nu} - \Lambda G_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(B^2) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We therefore see that to this order the field equations decouple and it makes sense to consider the symmetric background, to be just a GR background. The problem then reduces to the study of an antisymmetric tensor field coupled to GR.

III. THE COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF THE B-FIELD

In this section we study the behavior of the B-field in an expanding universe [19]. Our background metric is given by the usual (conformal) Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker metric (FLRW):

$$G_{\mu\nu} = a(\eta)^2 \eta_{\mu\nu}, \tag{8}$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$, η is conformal time and $a(\eta)$ is the conformal scale factor. The conformal time is related to the standard cosmological time by, $a d\eta = dt$. The scale factor during the different cosmological eras is given in table I, where $H_I \sim 10^{13}$ GeV is the Hubble parameter during inflation and η_e is the conformal time at matter-radiation equality. For the rest of this section it is important to note that Eq. (6) implies that

$$H_I \gg m. \tag{9}$$

Of course, this bound can be amply satisfied even when the B -field mass, m , is much greater than what is indicated in Eq. (6).

A. The lagrangian and the field equations

The linearized Lagrangian for the B -field reads in conformal metric,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{a^2} \eta^{\alpha\beta} \eta^{\rho\sigma} \eta^{\mu\nu} H_{\alpha\rho\mu} H_{\beta\sigma\nu} + (\beta R + \frac{1}{4} m^2) B_{\alpha\beta} B_{\rho\sigma} \eta^{\alpha\rho} \eta^{\beta\sigma} \\ & - \frac{\alpha}{a^2} R_{\mu\nu} B_{\lambda\rho} B_{\alpha\sigma} \eta^{\lambda\mu} \eta^{\rho\alpha} \eta^{\sigma\nu} - \frac{\gamma}{a^4} R_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} B_{\rho\sigma} B_{\lambda\kappa} \eta^{\rho\mu} \eta^{\sigma\nu} \eta^{\lambda\alpha} \eta^{\kappa\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here the geometric tensors, R , $R_{\mu\nu}$, $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, derived from the metric (8) are given in appendix B and $\mathcal{H}$ is the conformal Hubble parameter given by $\mathcal{H} = a'/a$, where $a' = da/d\eta$, denotes a derivative with respect to conformal time. This lagrangian leads to the following equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho H_{\sigma\alpha\beta} - 2\mathcal{H} H_{0\alpha\beta} + 2a^2 \left(2\beta\mathcal{R} + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \right) B_{\alpha\beta} \\ & - 2a^2 \alpha (\mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_\alpha B_{\beta\lambda} + \mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_\beta B_{\lambda\alpha}) - 4a^2 \gamma \mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_\alpha{}^\kappa{}_\beta B_{\lambda\kappa} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Next we act with $\eta^{\alpha\lambda} \partial_\lambda$ on (11) divided by $2a^2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & a^{-2} \left(-4\alpha\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}' + (12\beta + 4\alpha\mathcal{H}'') - (24\beta + 4\alpha)\mathcal{H}^3 \right) B_{\beta 0} \\ & + \left(-12\beta(\mathcal{H}^2 + \mathcal{H}') + \frac{1}{2} a^2 m^2 \right) a^{-2} \eta^{\alpha\lambda} \partial_\lambda B_{\alpha\beta} \\ & - \alpha \left(\mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_\alpha \eta^{\alpha\rho} \partial_\rho B_{\beta\lambda} + \mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_\beta \eta^{\alpha\rho} \partial_\rho B_{\lambda\alpha} \right) - 2\gamma \eta^{\alpha\rho} \partial_\rho \left(a^{-2} \eta^{\kappa\sigma} \mathcal{R}^\lambda{}_{\alpha\sigma\beta} B_{\lambda\kappa} \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The 0 and the i components of this equation lead to the following two consistency conditions ($i = 1, 2, 3$)

$$\mathcal{X} \eta^{ij} \partial_j B_{0i} = 0 \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_0 (\mathcal{X} B_{j0}) + \mathcal{Y} \eta^{ik} \partial_k B_{ji} = 0, \quad (14)$$

where we defined

$$\mathcal{X} = a^{-2} \left((12\beta + 2\alpha)\mathcal{H}^2 + (12\beta + 4\alpha - 2\gamma)\mathcal{H}' - \frac{1}{2} m^2 a^2 \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = a^{-2} \left((12\beta + 4\alpha - 2\gamma)\mathcal{H}^2 + (12\beta + 2\alpha)\mathcal{H}' - \frac{1}{2} m^2 a^2 \right). \quad (16)$$

Next we consider the equations of motion (11). The $0i$ and the ij components give

$$a^{-2} \eta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho \left(\partial_\sigma B_{0i} + \partial_0 B_{i\sigma} + \partial_i B_{\sigma 0} \right) + 2\mathcal{X} B_{j0} = 0 \quad (17)$$

$$a^{-2} \left[\eta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho \left(\partial_\sigma B_{ij} + \partial_i B_{j\sigma} + \partial_j B_{\sigma i} \right) - \mathcal{H} \left(\partial_0 B_{ij} + \partial_i B_{j0} + \partial_j B_{0i} \right) \right] + 2\mathcal{Y} B_{ij} = 0 \quad (18)$$

Equations (13),(14),(17) and (18) determine the complete evolution of the B field.

B. Solving for the 'electric' component

For the rest of our discussion we will only consider the 'electric' component of the B field: $B_{0i} \equiv E_i$, where it is understood that E is a vector. We don't study the 'magnetic' component, since it turns out that it is completely regular and thus for our purposes not very interesting. If we assume $\mathcal{X} \neq 0$, then we easily find, using (13), (14) and (17) that

$$a^{-2} \left(\eta^{rs} \partial_r \partial_s E + \partial_0 (\mathcal{Y}^{-1} \partial_0 (\mathcal{X} E)) \right) - 2\mathcal{X} E = 0. \quad (19)$$

To study the behavior of this equation, we first rescale E :

$$E = \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{Y}}}{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{E} \quad (20)$$

to obtain

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{\mathcal{Y}}{\mathcal{X}} \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + M_{eff}^2 \right] \tilde{E} = 0, \quad (21)$$

where the effective mass term is given by

$$M_{eff}^2 = -2\mathcal{Y}a^2 + \frac{\mathcal{Y}''}{2\mathcal{Y}} - \frac{3(\mathcal{Y}')^2}{4\mathcal{Y}^2}. \quad (22)$$

So we see from (21) that $\tilde{E}$ behaves just as a massive vectorfield, *as long as*, $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X} > 0$. We see for example that in Fourier space we have

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 + \frac{\mathcal{Y}}{\mathcal{X}} k^2 + M_{eff}^2 \right] \tilde{E}_F = 0, \quad (23)$$

where k is the momentum. Therefore, if $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X} > 0$, $\tilde{E}$ is a fluctuating, finite field and large values of k will be suppressed. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X} < 0$, for sufficiently large momenta, $(\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X})k^2 + M_{eff}^2 < 0$. For these momenta the field $\tilde{E}$ grows exponentially without bounds. Such a situation is unstable and thus not physically viable. Therefore, if in such a case the transformation (20) is regular, the theory is unphysical. One could worry as well about the cases when, $M_{eff}^2 < 0$. However on dimensional grounds, the effective mass squared scales in the worst case as, $1/\eta^2$. Such a scaling results in a standard power-law enhancement on super-Hubble scales [19] and presents no problem.

C. de Sitter inflation

During de Sitter inflation (see table I), Eq. (21) becomes (we use subscripts I , r or m for the fields to indicate whether we are considering inflation, radiation or matter era)

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + M_I^2 \right] \tilde{E}_I = 0, \quad (24)$$

where

$$M_I^2 = \frac{1}{\eta^2} \left((4\gamma - 12\alpha - 48\beta) + \frac{m^2}{H_I^2} \right). \quad (25)$$

So we see that during de Sitter inflation, the field is perfectly regular. Notice that any 'negative mass' contribution indeed scales as $1/\eta^2$.

During de Sitter inflation the rescaling (20) is nonsingular as long as

$$6\alpha + 24\beta - 2\gamma - \frac{m^2}{2H_I^2} \neq 0 \quad (26)$$

D. Radiation era

During radiation era we obtain

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{H_I^2 m^2 \eta^4 + 4(\gamma - \alpha)}{H_I^2 m^2 \eta^4 - 4(\gamma - \alpha)} \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + M_r^2 \right] \tilde{E}_r = 0. \quad (27)$$

Here M_r is the effective mass during radiation, which is given by a complicated expression. Fortunately its precise form is not important for us. It is sufficient to say that it indeed scales as $1/\eta^2$ and therefore it does not cause any problems. We see however, that we might have problems in this case with the sign of the coefficient in front of the spatial derivatives. For example if we look at the beginning of radiation era ($\eta = 1/H_I$) we see that if we want $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X}$ to be positive, we need that m^2/H_I^2 is *at least*, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha - \gamma)$. In other words we approximately need:

$$m \geq |\alpha - \gamma| H_I \sim |\alpha - \gamma| \times 10^{13} \text{ GeV}, \quad (28)$$

which, unless $|\alpha - \gamma|$ is very small, contradicts Eq. (6). Therefore if we require $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X}$ to be positive, we either need to fine-tune α or γ such that $\alpha - \gamma$ is sufficiently small to satisfy the bound (28), or we could use the more natural requirement that $\alpha = \gamma$. The latter case will be examined in more detail in section III F.

For now we assume that $|\alpha - \gamma|$ is not unnaturally small, so we can effectively neglect the term, $H_I^2 m^2 \eta^4$ in Eq (27) at the beginning of radiation era and we get, $\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{X} = -1$. Therefore we obtain an unstable equation of motion for $\tilde{E}$, implying that $\tilde{E}$ grows exponentially during radiation era. Of course this growth is a problem only if the transformation (20) is regular. One readily checks that during radiation era, Eq. (20) is non-singular if

$$4(\alpha - \gamma) + H_I^2 m^2 \eta^4 \neq 0. \quad (29)$$

This is clearly the case, since we consider $\alpha - \gamma$ to be dominant and nonzero. Therefore we conclude that, unless $\alpha - \gamma$ is tiny, the equation of motion (27) develops an instability at the beginning of radiation era.

E. Matter era

During matter era the equation of motion becomes

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{H_I^2 m^2 (\eta_e + \eta)^6 \eta_e^{-4} - 128(3\alpha + 6\beta - 2\gamma)}{H_I^2 m^2 (\eta_e + \eta)^6 \eta_e^{-4} - 128(6\beta + \gamma)} \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + M_m^2 \right] \tilde{E}_m = 0, \quad (30)$$

where M_m is again a complicated – but for our purposes not very interesting – expression. The factor in front of the spatial derivatives does not cause any problems, since the term $H_I^2 m^2 (\eta_e + \eta)^6 \eta_e^{-4}$ dominates over the term containing the α , β and γ . The field rescaling (20) is during matter era non-singular if

$$-768\beta - 128\gamma + H_I^2 m^2 \frac{(\eta_e + \eta)^6}{\eta^4} \neq 0. \quad (31)$$

This relation always holds, since the last term dominates.

F. Special cases

The first special case we consider is $\alpha = \gamma$. As was noted above, the case $\alpha = \gamma$ is special, since now the instability at the beginning of radiation era appears to be solved. We notice that if $\alpha = \gamma$ we have

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = a^{-2} \left((12\beta + 2\gamma)(\mathcal{H}^2 + \mathcal{H}') - \frac{a^2 m^2}{2} \right) \quad (32)$$

Now if we assume (26) to hold ($\beta \neq \frac{\gamma}{12}(\frac{m^2}{4H_I^2} - 2\alpha)$), the only era where we have potentially problems is radiation. However during radiation era we find that

$$\mathcal{H}_r^2 + \mathcal{H}'_r = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{X} = -\frac{m^2}{2} \quad (33)$$

and therefore the equation of motion (21) reduces to

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + m^2 a^2 \right] E_r = 0 \quad (\alpha = \gamma). \quad (34)$$

So we find that the unrescaled field behaves perfectly regularly during radiation era.

The next case we consider is the (local) situation where $\alpha = \gamma$, $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{X}' \neq 0$. This exactly corresponds to the cases where Eq. (20) becomes singular. Also notice that $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow 0$ is only possible if $\beta > -\gamma/6$. In this case one finds that (14) reduces to

$$(12\beta + 2\alpha)(\mathcal{H}'' - \mathcal{H}^3)E = 0 \quad (35)$$

and thus E is constrained to become zero at one point in time. Such a constraint on a dynamical degree of freedom would normally be unacceptable. Here this is not the case however, since we also find from (22) that at that moment,

$$M_{eff} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (36)$$

Therefore E is dynamically pushed to zero (it becomes nondynamical) at the moment under consideration and the constraint (35) presents no problem.

The last special case we consider is the case where not only $\alpha = \gamma$, but also $\beta = -\gamma/6$. Now we find that

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = -\frac{m^2}{2} \quad (37)$$

and therefore during all eras the equation of motion reduces to the following simple form:

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j + m^2 a^2 \right] E = 0 \quad \left(\alpha = \gamma \quad ; \quad \beta = -\frac{\gamma}{6} \right). \quad (38)$$

Despite the elegant form, there is unfortunately nothing that tells us to constrain β .

IV. EVOLUTION IN A SCHWARZSCHILD BACKGROUND

The other case we will consider is the behavior of the B -field in a Schwarzschild background. Although the background is clearly spherically symmetric, there is no need for the B -field to also be spherically symmetric, so we will not explicitly make it so. The metric (in spherical coordinates) is given by

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag} \left\{ 1 - \frac{2M_s}{r}, -\left(1 - \frac{2M_s}{r}\right)^{-1}, -r^2, -r^2 \sin^2 \theta \right\}, \quad (39)$$

where M_s is the Schwarzschild mass parameter. The equation of motion for the B -field reduces in this spacetime to

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho (\sqrt{-G} H^{\rho\mu\nu}) + \sqrt{-G} \left(\frac{m^2}{2} B^{\mu\nu} - 2\gamma B^{\alpha\beta} R^\mu{}_\alpha{}^\nu{}_\beta \right) = 0, \quad (40)$$

with

$$\sqrt{-G} = r^2 \sin \theta \quad (41)$$

and the relevant components of the Riemann tensor are given in appendix B. Notice that (40) is independent of α and β since the metric is Ricci-flat. We next act with ∂_μ on (40) and divide by $\sqrt{-G}$ to obtain the following consistency equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{m^2}{2} \partial_\mu B^{\mu\nu} - 2\gamma \partial_\mu (B^{\alpha\beta} R^\mu{}_\alpha{}^\nu{}_\beta) \\ & + \frac{m^2}{r} B^{1\nu} - \frac{4\gamma}{r} B^{\alpha\beta} R^1{}_\alpha{}^\nu{}_\beta + \frac{m^2}{2} \cot \theta B^{2\nu} - 2\gamma \cot \theta B^{\alpha\beta} R^\mu{}_\alpha{}^\nu{}_\beta = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The precise structure of these constraints is not very clear, so we consider the four different components separately. We obtain (the index a in Eqs. (44–46) indicates the angular directions: $a = 2 \equiv \theta, a = 3 \equiv \phi = 3$),

$$\mathcal{T}B^{10} + \mathcal{R} \cot \theta B^{20} + \mathcal{S} \partial_1 B^{10} + \mathcal{R} \partial_a B^{a0} = 0 \quad (43)$$

$$\mathcal{R} \cot \theta B^{21} - \mathcal{S} \partial_0 B^{10} + \mathcal{R} \partial_a B^{a1} = 0 \quad (44)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}B^{12} - \mathcal{R} \partial_0 B^{20} - \mathcal{R} \partial_1 B^{21} - \mathcal{S} \partial_3 B^{23} = 0 \quad (45)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}B^{13} + \mathcal{S} \cot \theta B^{23} - \mathcal{R} \partial_0 B^{30} - \mathcal{R} \partial_1 B^{31} - \mathcal{S} \partial_2 B^{32} = 0, \quad (46)$$

where we have defined

$$\mathcal{Q} \equiv \frac{m^2}{r} + \frac{2\gamma M_s}{r^4} \quad (47)$$

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{m^2}{2} - \frac{2\gamma M_s}{r^3} \quad (48)$$

$$\mathcal{S} \equiv \frac{m^2}{2} + \frac{4\gamma M_s}{r^3} \quad (49)$$

$$\mathcal{T} \equiv \frac{m^2}{r} - \frac{4\gamma M_s}{r^4}. \quad (50)$$

After a rescaling

$$B^{10} \rightarrow \tilde{B}^{10} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \quad B^{23} \rightarrow \tilde{B}^{23} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}}, \quad (51)$$

we can combine the constraints in the following more elegant form:

$$\partial_\mu \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{B}^{1\nu} + \cot \theta \tilde{B}^{2\nu} = 0. \quad (52)$$

Next we consider the (unrescaled) equations of motion for the B -field. Using (40) we find that

$$\partial_\rho H^{\rho\mu\nu} + \frac{2}{r} H^{1\mu\nu} + \cot \theta H^{2\mu\nu} + 4\delta_{[0}^\mu \delta_{1]}^\nu (\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{R}) B^{01} + 4\delta_{[2}^\mu \delta_{3]}^\nu (\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{R}) B^{23} + 2\mathcal{R} B^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (53)$$

We now focus on B^{01} . After the rescaling (51), we obtain from the 01-component of (53):

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \left(\cot \theta \partial^2 + \partial^2 \partial_2 + \partial^3 \partial_3 + 2\mathcal{S} \right) \tilde{B}^{01} \\ & + \cot \theta (\partial^0 \tilde{B}^{12}) + \partial^0 (\partial_2 \tilde{B}^{12} + \partial_3 \tilde{B}^{13}) \\ & + \cot \theta (\partial^1 \tilde{B}^{20}) + \partial^1 (\partial_2 \tilde{B}^{20} + \partial_3 \tilde{B}^{30}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Next we use (52) to write the last two lines in terms of $\tilde{B}^{01}$ to obtain

$$\left[\partial^0 \partial_0 + \partial^1 \partial_1 + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \left(\partial^2 \partial_2 + \cot \theta \partial^2 + \partial^3 \partial_3 \right) + 2\mathcal{R} + \partial^1 \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{R}} \right) + \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{R}} \partial^1 \right] \tilde{B}^{01} = 0 \quad (55)$$

We rescale the field to get rid of the single derivative term.

$$\hat{B}^{01} = \lambda \tilde{B}^{01} = -\frac{\sqrt{r}\sqrt{4\gamma M_s - m^2 r^3}}{8\gamma M_s + m^2 r^3} \quad (56)$$

where we have defined

$$\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{r}}{\sqrt{4\gamma M_s - m^2 r^3}}. \quad (57)$$

Finally we divide (55) by g^{00} and get

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{(r - 2M_s)^2}{r^2} \partial_1 \partial_1 - \frac{r - 2M_s}{r} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} L^2 + M_{eff}^2 \right] \hat{B}^{01} = 0, \quad (58)$$

where the effective mass term is now given by

$$M_{eff}^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2M_s}{r} \right) \left(2\mathcal{R} - g^{11} \partial_1 \partial_1 \lambda \right). \quad (59)$$

and the operator L^2 is defined to be

$$L^2 = \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\partial_2 \partial_2 + \cot \theta \partial_2 + \frac{1}{\sin^2 \theta} \partial_3 \partial_3 \right) \quad (60)$$

When the solution of Eq. (58) is written in a factorized form, $\tilde{B}^{01} = \sum_{lm} b_{lm}(r) Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, the operator L^2 generates a centrifugal barrier term, $-l(l+1)/r^2$, where $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ is the multipole moment. Therefore we see that, depending on the sign of $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$, we have similar problems as with the cosmological solutions (21). If $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ is positive (we only consider fields outside the Schwarzschild radius, $r > 2M_s$), we have a normal, well behaving field, since the field for high values of l is suppressed. On the other hand if $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ is negative, high values of l are no longer suppressed, and the field $\tilde{B}^{01}$ grows exponentially without a limit. Such a situation is clearly unstable. We evaluate $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ using (48) and (49) and find that

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{m^2 r^3 - 4\gamma M_s}{m^2 r^3 + 2\gamma M_s}. \quad (61)$$

We see that there are certainly finite values for r and M_s where this quantity becomes negative. In these regions the field is unstable, as was explained above. Note that $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ is negative when,

$$r < r_{cr} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{4\gamma M_s}{m^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} & \text{for } \gamma > 0 \\ \left(\frac{-2\gamma M_s}{m^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} & \text{for } \gamma < 0 \end{cases}. \quad (62)$$

Since there is no reason to believe that γ is particularly small and that m^{-1} should be less than the Schwarzschild radius, $r_s = 2M_s$, for *all* spherically symmetric mass distributions in the Universe, we conclude that the condition (62) will be satisfied at least somewhere in the Universe.

Since the B -field should be stable for all values of M_s and r , for a sensible theory the sign of $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ should be independent of M_s and r . The only solution for this requirement is fixing $\gamma = 0$. In this case we have $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S} = 1$ and the equation of motion (58) simplifies to

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{(r - 2M_s)}{r} \left(\frac{(r - 2M_s)}{r} \partial_1 \partial_1 + L^2 \right) + M_{eff}^2 \right] \tilde{B}^{01} = 0 \quad (\gamma = 0), \quad (63)$$

where

$$M_{eff}^2 = \frac{(r - 2M_s)}{r} \left(m^2 + \frac{2r - 4M_s}{r^3} \right) \quad (\gamma = 0). \quad (64)$$

Thus we see that (outside the Schwarzschild radius) the mass gets a positive enhancement. The field behaves perfectly regular and similar –but not equal– to a ‘normal’ massive vectorfield in a Schwarzschild geometry.

V. ANALYSIS

A. Discussion of the evolution in a FRLW universe

The calculations done in section III lead to the conclusion that, if we assume that the mass of the B -field is much less than H_I and we want to avoid fine tuning, the couplings of the B -field to the background curvature, we must choose $\alpha = \gamma$. If we do not make this choice, then at the beginning of radiation era the B field becomes unstable and grows exponentially without a bound. We have also shown that the field equations are regular for this choice of the parameters. Looking back at the calculation we see that the reason these instabilities occur lies in the fact that there are two functions in front of the different components in the field equations ($\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, see Eqs. (15–16)), that could have a relative minus sign. This then leads to the possibility of the ‘wrong’ sign in front of the spatial derivatives (58). Indeed the choice $\alpha = \gamma$ is the only possibility where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ independent of the free parameters of the theory.

The fact that we have a constraint on the couplings to the background, means that given a non-linearized lagrangian, one of the parameters of the decomposition (2) is actually fixed. So, while we are not able to a priori tell how to decompose the metric into its symmetric and antisymmetric components, consistency of the theory during all epochs of the Universe gives us one constraint. Since there are two arbitrary parameters in (2) we are however not able to completely fix the decomposition. The special choice $\beta = -\gamma/6$ for example would completely fix it, but except perhaps for simplicity, we are not aware of any physical reason why would this be the correct choice.

One could hope that looking at curved FLRW spacetimes might give a new constraint. These cases have also been checked and lead to essentially the same results.

B. Discussion of the evolution in a Schwarzschild background

In section IV we considered the evolution of a non-constrained B -field in a spherically symmetric (Schwarzschild) background. We found that, unless we choose $\gamma = 0$, the B -field always has an unstable mode for particular values of M_s and r . Since there is no reason to exclude these values, we can only conclude that we should take $\gamma = 0$ for the theory to be consistent. The seeds for these inconsistencies lie, similarly as in the cosmological case, in the possibility of a relative minus sign between the coefficients of the different components in the field equations (in particular the coefficients $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$, see (48–49)). Unfortunately, as we have shown in appendix A, $\gamma = 0$ is not possible within NGT in first order formalism. In fact one finds that an initial lagrangian that linearizes to a theory with $\gamma = 0$ also has the coefficient in front of H^2 equal to zero. So this becomes a trivial, nondynamical theory.

One might hope that perhaps a formulation of the theory in the second order formalism solves the problems and indeed one finds that now it is possible to find a full Lagrangian that gives $\gamma = 0$. However in [14] it is shown that in such a case, one always gets at some higher order n in B terms of the form RB^n . In the next section VC we argue that these terms play exactly the same rôle as the RB^2 terms we considered.

Therefore the instabilities are present both in the first and second order formulations. We must thus conclude that there is no geometric full Lagrangian, as considered in appendix A, that correspond to a stable theory at linearized level.

This result is no big surprise, since it was already noted by Clayton in [16] that NGT has linearization instabilities. The nature of the instabilities we describe is however essentially different from the Cauchy instabilities Clayton finds. There are two proposed solutions for the instabilities Clayton discusses. First of all one might hope that corrections beyond linearized level might stabilize the theory. We address this issue in the next section where we are lead to the conjecture that our instabilities make NGT unstable beyond linearized level. Secondly, it was proposed in [18] to modify the theory with lagrange multipliers that dynamically put the unstable modes to zero. In section VD we show that these dynamical constraints do not resolve the instabilities we address.

C. Extending the results beyond linearized level: A conjecture

Our results so far only apply to the linearized version of NGT. Since we showed that in this limit the field grows without a bound, one is lead to the conclusion that the linearization *Ansatz* of a small B -field, is not anymore valid. We therefore need to consider NGT at higher orders. Already if we look at the quadratic order, we encounter many mathematical complexities, since (as is clear from (5)) Einstein's field equations get a modification of order B^2 . Therefore the standard GR solutions $G_{\mu\nu}$ for the symmetric metric are not anymore a solution of the theory beyond linear level. Instead we assume we have (at quadratic order)

$$g_{(\mu\nu)} = G_{\mu\nu} + f_{\mu\nu}(B^2, H^2, G), \quad (65)$$

where $f_{\mu\nu}$ is some unknown function of order B^2 that vanishes if $B^2 \rightarrow 0$. Therefore the B -field backreacts on the background metric. It has been argued by Clayton [16] that such a backreaction might stabilize the theory, since the B -field in such a case acquires additional degrees of freedom (similarly to [17]).

We will now look in a more detailed manner at the equations of motion for the B -field at higher order in the specific case where the GR background is the Schwarzschild metric. First of all notice that there will not be a quadratic contribution to the B -field equations of motion. The reason is that there will be no cubic contributions to the lagrangian, just as there is no linear contribution. So therefore the first order we can consider is quartic in the lagrangian and therefore cubic in the field equations. Although the function $f_{\mu\nu}$ may be complicated, it is clear that a typical term that arises in these equations is ($R_{\rho\alpha\sigma\beta}$ refers to the GR solution),

$$R_{\rho\alpha\sigma\beta} B^{\rho\sigma} B^{\alpha\beta} B^{\mu\nu}. \quad (66)$$

An explicit calculation shows that this term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{2M_s}{r^3} (B^{01})^2 + \frac{M_s(2M_s - r)}{r^2} (B^{02})^2 + (B^{03})^2 \frac{M_s(2M_s - r)}{r^2} \sin^2 \theta \right. \\ & \left. - (B^{12})^2 \frac{M_s}{2M_s - r} - (B^{13})^2 \frac{M_s}{2M_s - r} \sin^2 \theta - (B^{23})^2 2M_s r \sin^2 \theta \right) B^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Therefore we see that the different components of the B field appear with different coefficients in front of them. More importantly we see that, depending on the values of M_s and r , there could be a relative minus sign between various terms. Looking back at the calculations in section IV, one sees that these relative minus signs are also present at linear level (although the coefficients differ, see Eq. (53)). We also have seen that, depending on whether we have

such a relative minus sign, we may or may not get a relative minus sign between the ∂_0^2 and the ∂_i^2 terms, and thus we may or may not get instabilities. The question now is if the relative minus signs in (67) implies the same for the cubic sector of the theory.

First we assume we can solve the cubic equations of motion for only one of the components of the B -field (which we call b). Then, in analogy with section IV, we obtain an equation of motion of the following form (we assume that single derivative terms can be eliminated by a rescaling of b)

$$(1 + \alpha_1 b^2) \partial_0^2 b + \alpha_2 b + \alpha_3 b^3 + \alpha_4 b (\partial_0 b)^2 = 0. \quad (68)$$

The precise value of the various α_i 's depends on the specific form of the higher order lagrangian and the function $f_{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (65). α_2 and α_3 depend also on the momenta (spatial derivatives) of the field component. Eq. (67) strongly suggests that the sign of the different α 's is dependent on the values of M_s and r . Therefore we see that α_2 and/or α_3 can be negative. Since $|\alpha_{2,3}|$ can be as large as we want (because of the momentum dependence), we find by numerical analysis that (68) always can develop instabilities (independent of the sign of α_1 or α_4). Therefore, although we have not proven it, the similarity between (67) and (53) indicates that, for certain choices of the parameters and coordinates, the necessary conditions for the instabilities to occur can always be met. Thus it appears that NGT is also unstable at cubic order. In fact since at higher orders in B there is no new structure to be expected, we are lead to the conjecture that NGT is unstable at all orders.

The largest pitfall in the above argument is that it might not be possible to decouple the different modes of the B -field. In such a case (68) would change to an equation of the form

$$(1 + \alpha_1 b_1^2) \partial_0^2 b_1 + \alpha_2 b_1 + \alpha_3 b_1^3 + \alpha_4 b_1 (\partial_0 b_1)^2 = \mathcal{D}[b_i], \quad (69)$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is some second order differential operator acting in general on all components $b_i \neq b_1$ and with derivatives with respect to – possibly – all four coordinates. It is clear from the above discussion that the 'homogeneous' differential equation (with $\mathcal{D} = 0$) would give instabilities. The coupling between the differential equations induced by the operator $\mathcal{D}$ in Eq. (69) may be such that the field components mutually stabilize each other. The question is whether this indeed can happen in a physically meaningful way. To investigate this consider the following toy model:

$$\begin{aligned} f''(t) - k_f^2 f(t) &= \alpha g'(t) \\ g''(t) - k_g^2 g(t) &= \beta f'(t). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

We expect this system to be representative of the dynamics of small B -field fluctuations around some general background metric which also includes nonlinear antisymmetric metric contributions. In Eq. (70) a *prime* denotes a time derivative, k_f and k_g refer to the momenta of the field components f and g , α and β are functions of the background metric fields ' $G_{\mu\nu}$ ' and ' $B_{\mu\nu}$ ', possibly their first space or time derivatives (and thus they may be linear in k_f and k_g), and the parameters of the theory (M_s and r in the Schwarzschild case). In general the structure of the second spatial derivative terms in Eq. (70) is not so simple (*cf.* Eq. (58)), but the case considered here is representative for a more general situation. Indeed, the above discussion shows that the general second order spatial derivative terms reduce to the form (70) for certain ranges of the coordinates. Looking at (54) shows that the coupling in Eq. (70) is exactly the type of coupling we would expect between the different field components in NGT after we rescale away all single derivative terms. A more general coupling could also include $\rho g''(t) + \sigma g(t)$, but this would not alter the following discussion. The system (70) gives rise to the following eigenvalue equation

$$(\omega^2 + k_f^2)(\omega^2 + k_g^2) + \omega^2 \alpha \beta = 0, \quad (71)$$

when the solution is decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i e^{i\omega_i t} \\ g(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^4 b_i e^{i\omega_i t}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Thus the system is unstable if at least for one root $\Im(\omega_i) < 0$ ($\Im$ indicates the imaginary part). We can solve (71) to obtain

$$\omega^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(-k_f^2 - k_g^2 - \alpha\beta \pm \sqrt{(k_f^2 + k_g^2 + \alpha\beta)^2 - 4k_f^2 k_g^2} \right). \quad (73)$$

First note that if $\Im(\omega^2) \neq 0$, then there is at least one root for which $\Im(\omega) < 0$ is satisfied, and the system is unstable. So the necessary condition for the stability of the system is, $\Im(\omega^2) = 0$. From Eq. (73) we then easily infer that this condition is obeyed provided,

$$\alpha\beta > -(k_f - k_g)^2 \quad (74)$$

or

$$\alpha\beta < -(k_f + k_g)^2. \quad (75)$$

It is clear that it is impossible to satisfy the second equation for all values of the momenta. However the first equation can be satisfied if $\alpha\beta > 0$. When $\Im(\omega^2) = 0$ is satisfied, the sufficient condition for stability is then, $\Re(\omega^2) > 0$ (indicating the real part), which implies,

$$k_f^2 + k_g^2 + \alpha\beta < 0, \quad (\alpha\beta > 0) \quad (76)$$

Since we also require, $\alpha\beta > 0$, both are impossible to satisfy simultaneously. We hence conclude that there always is an unstable root of Eq. (73) with $\Im(\omega) < 0$, which destabilizes the system (70).

While the full analysis of cubic, coupled differential equations is much more difficult, based on the analysis of small fluctuations around a nonlinear background, we have argued that the same results apply: it is not possible to couple the unstable modes in such a way that the system stabilizes for all values of the momenta. The fact that the coupling constants in general depend on M_s and r only make matters worse.

Finally, our analysis of the case where the different components of the B -field mutually couple, indicates that our conjecture holds and NGT is indeed unstable beyond linearized level.

D. Dynamically constrained NGT

In order to solve the instabilities discovered in NGT by Clayton [16], Moffat proposed the introduction of an extra term to the full Lagrangian [18] that looks like

$$\mathcal{L}_{DNGT} = \sqrt{-g} g^{\mu\nu} J_{[\mu} \phi_{\nu]}. \quad (77)$$

Here J_μ is some source vector and ϕ_ν plays the rôle of a Lagrange multiplier. This new term then leads to the dynamical constraint

$$g^{[i0]} = 0. \quad (78)$$

Since these are exactly the unstable modes Clayton found, these instabilities are dynamically resolved. One might hope that this extra constraint also solves the instabilities we have found.

1. The cosmological case

For the cosmological case we find from (13), (14), (17) and (18) that (if $\mathcal{Y} \neq 0$) the dynamics of the dynamically constrained theory are determined by

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \delta^{rs} \partial_r \partial_s - \mathcal{H} \partial_0 + 2a^2 \mathcal{Y} \right] B_{ij} = 0. \quad (79)$$

After a rescaling

$$B_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \tilde{B}_{ij} \quad (80)$$

one finds that

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \delta^{rs} \partial_r \partial_s + M_{eff}^2 \right] \tilde{B}_{ij} = 0, \quad (81)$$

which indeed has well behaving solutions.

2. The Schwarzschild case

However for the Schwarzschild case we will now show that the problems remain, although in a somewhat different disguise. We focus on the 12-component of the field equations (40) and obtain

$$\left[\partial^0 \partial_0 + \partial^3 \partial_3 + 2\mathcal{R} \right] B^{12} + \partial_3 (\partial^1 B^{23} + \partial^2 B^{31}) = 0. \quad (82)$$

Using the unrescaled constraint equations (45) and (46) we obtain

$$\left[\partial^0 \partial_0 + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \partial^1 \partial_1 + \partial^2 \partial_2 + \cot \theta \partial^2 + \partial^3 \partial_3 \right] B^{12} + g^{11} \left[\left(\partial_1 \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} + \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{S}} \right) \partial_1 + \left(\partial_1 \frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{S}} \right) \right] B^{12} + \partial^2 \cot \theta B^{12} = 0. \quad (83)$$

Next we rescale $B^{12} = f(r) \tilde{B}^{12}$ with some function $f(r)$ that is determined by the requirement that the single derivative terms in (83) cancel:

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}}{\mathcal{S}} + \partial_1 \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \right) f(r) + 2 \frac{\mathcal{R}}{\mathcal{S}} \partial_1 f(r) = 0. \quad (84)$$

This equation can be solved, although the resulting expression is rather complicated. The final result for the equation of motion is

$$\left[\partial_0 \partial_0 - \frac{(r - 2M_s)^2 \mathcal{R}}{r^2 \mathcal{S}} \partial_1 \partial_1 - \frac{r - 2M_s}{r} L^2 + \text{mass term} \right] \tilde{B}^{21} = 0, \quad (85)$$

where the operator L^2 is defined in (60) and the mass term is some complicated function of r . We clearly see that our troubles are not resolved, since once again the sign of $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ determines whether the solutions are stable. Exactly as in section IV (cf. Eq (61)), there are

certainly values of M_s and r where the $\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{S}$ becomes negative. This results in an unstable solution for $\tilde{B}^{21}$. It can be shown that the function $f(r)$ is also regular in this regime.

As a final hope for stability one might try to impose even more Lagrange multipliers to also remove the unstable mode discussed above. However one finds that the mode B^{31} exhibits the same behavior as B^{21} and therefore should also be constrained to zero. Then one can show that the only remaining mode, B^{23} is unstable exactly when $B^{21} = B^{31} = 0$. Therefore we conclude that it is not possible to use dynamical constraints to remove the instabilities we found.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We consider the evolution of the Linearized NGT lagrangian in two different GR backgrounds. The first case we consider is a FLRW universe during three different cosmological eras. We show that, if the mass of the B -field is much smaller than H_I , the field always undergoes an unbounded growth at the beginning of radiation era. The simplest solution for this instability problem is to fix the parameters $\alpha = \gamma$ in the lagrangian (5).

The second case we consider is a Schwarzschild background. Here the problems are much more severe. First of all the occurrence of instabilities does not depend on the smallness of the mass of the B -field. Secondly the only way to remove the problems is by choosing $\gamma = 0$. Now this choice is not available in the first order formalism of NGT and therefore we conclude that the only stable linearized lagrangian must have the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-G} \left[R + 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{12}H^2 + \left(\frac{1}{4}m^2 + \beta R \right) B^2 \right] + \mathcal{O}(B^3) \quad (86)$$

and, as we show in Appendix A, this form cannot be obtained by linearizing NGT.

Since these results apply only for the linearized case, one might hope that considering higher order corrections stabilize the theory. One particular feature of higher order corrections is that Einstein's field equations get modified and therefore the standard GR solutions for the symmetric metric also get a modification of order B^2 . However, we have shown in Eq (67) that the seeds for the instabilities are also present at higher order and therefore, if we can decouple the equations of motion for each mode, there is nothing that can prevent the instabilities from growing. If we cannot decouple the equations of motion, the situation is more subtle. Now in principle we could hope that two (or more) unstable fields could couple in such a way that they stabilize each other. We have showed however by considering a simple, but representative example (see Eq. (70)), that it is in general not possible to get rid

of the instabilities. While we do not know exactly the nonlinear field equations, this result is most probably applicable to any coupling between the field components one can construct, up to any order. Therefore, while our discussion does not explicitly prove that the theory is unstable beyond linearized level, we have gathered enough evidence to conjecture that NGT is unstable for all orders in B .

One might also hope that modifying NGT could stabilize the theory. One modification of NGT that one can consider is dynamically constrained NGT [18]. This version of the theory was introduced to solve the problems with linearization instabilities discovered by Clayton [16] and therefore it might also resolve the instabilities we consider. We have shown that, while this modification does solve the instabilities in the FLRW background, the evolution in a Schwarzschild background remains unstable. We have also shown that we cannot add extra constraints in such a way that the unstable modes we have found disappear.

Another, perhaps more promising, way to go is to try to find theories with a nonsymmetric metric that linearize to the form in Eq. (86). One possibility might be to consider a theory on a hermitian, complex 4 dimensional manifold. In such a theory, the imaginary part of the metric must be antisymmetric and thus plays the rôle of the B -field. It is argued in [20] that the extra symmetries on the complex manifold, could act as diffeomorphisms for the B -field, thereby saving the gauge invariance (3). Such a theory has the properties we need for a physically viable theory, suggesting a possible direction to continue the study of nonsymmetric theories of gravity.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Wessel Valkenburg for bringing the original idea that lead to this paper. We would also like to thank Willem Westra for many interesting discussions and insights on the issue of NGT.

APPENDIX A: LINEARIZED NGT

In this appendix we sketch the calculation of the linearized NGT lagrangian, starting from the most general, covariant, two derivative lagrangian. We work within the first order formalism, where the connection is considered to be a dynamical field and use the following

notation and conventions,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{\mu\nu} &: \text{full, nonsymmetric metric} \\
W_{\mu\nu}^\alpha &: \text{full, nonsymmetric connection} \\
\mathcal{D} &: \text{covariant derivative w.r.t. the full connection} \\
\nabla &: \text{covariant derivative w.r.t. the zeroth order (Levi-Civita) connection} \\
Q &: \text{geometric tensors of the full theory} \\
R &: \text{geometric tensors of the zeroth order theory (GR)} \\
W_\mu &= W_{[\mu\alpha]}^\alpha \\
g_{(\mu\nu)} &= \frac{1}{2}(g_{\mu\nu} + g_{\nu\mu}) \\
g_{[\mu\nu]} &= \frac{1}{2}(g_{\mu\nu} - g_{\nu\mu}) \\
g_{\mu\alpha}g^{\mu\beta} &= g_{\alpha\mu}g^{\beta\mu} = \delta_\alpha^\beta \neq g_{\alpha\mu}g^{\mu\beta} \\
\frac{1}{16\pi G_N} &= 1
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

and we use the following expansion of $g_{\mu\nu}$ in terms of its symmetric (G) antisymmetric (B) part

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{\mu\nu} &= G_{\mu\nu} + B_{\mu\nu} + \rho B_{\mu\alpha}B^\alpha{}_\nu + \sigma B^2 G_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(B^3) \\
g^{\mu\nu} &= G^{\mu\nu} + B^{\mu\nu} + (1 - \rho)B^{\mu\alpha}B_\alpha{}^\nu + \sigma B^2 G^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(B^3).
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

This implies that

$$\sqrt{-g} = \sqrt{-G} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho + 4\sigma \right) B^2 \right) \tag{A3}$$

We use G to raise and lower indices. For other terms we use the subscript (n) to indicate it is n^{th} order in B (in general when there is no such subscript will mean a 'full' quantity).

The Riemann tensor is defined in terms of the connection

$$Q^\mu{}_{\nu\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha W_{\nu\beta}^\mu - \partial_\beta W_{\nu\alpha}^\mu - W_{\nu\alpha}^\sigma W_{\sigma\beta}^\mu + W_{\nu\beta}^\rho W_{\rho\alpha}^\mu \tag{A4}$$

and the Ricci tensor is also defined as usual

$$Q_{\mu\nu} \equiv R^\lambda{}_{\mu\lambda\nu} = \partial_\lambda W_{\mu\nu}^\lambda - \partial_\nu W_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda - W_{\mu\lambda}^\sigma W_{\sigma\nu}^\lambda + W_{\mu\nu}^\rho W_{\rho\tau}^\tau. \tag{A5}$$

Since the Riemann tensor (A4) does not have its usual symmetries (in fact it is only anti-symmetric in α and β), we can make another, independent contraction (that would be zero in GR)

$$P_{\mu\nu} \equiv R^\lambda{}_{\lambda\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu W_{\lambda\nu}^\lambda - \partial_\nu W_{\lambda\mu}^\lambda \tag{A6}$$

Finally we define our covariant derivatives by the ‘+−’ relation:

$$\nabla_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta} - W_{\alpha\mu}^\rho g_{\rho\beta} - W_{\mu\beta}^\rho g_{\alpha\rho} \quad (\text{A7})$$

And we choose our Lagrangian in such a way that the other possible definitions of the connection do not give new information. Our starting lagrangian is [14]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-g} g^{\mu\nu} & \left[Q_{\mu\nu} + a_1 P_{\mu\nu} + a_2 \partial_{[\mu} W_{\nu]} \right. \\ & + b_1 \mathcal{D}_\lambda W_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda + b_2 W_{[\mu\alpha]}^\lambda W_{[\lambda\nu]}^\alpha + b_3 W_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda W_{\lambda]} \\ & g^{\lambda\delta} g_{\alpha\beta} \left(c_1 W_{[\mu\lambda]}^\alpha W_{[\nu\delta]}^\beta + c_2 W_{[\mu\nu]}^\alpha W_{[\lambda\delta]}^\beta + c_3 W_{[\mu\delta]}^\alpha W_{[\nu\lambda]}^\beta \right) \\ & \left. + d W_\mu W_\nu + 2\Lambda \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

where the parameters a_1 , a_2 , etc. are unconstrained [22] and Λ is the cosmological constant.

1. Calculating the connection

To calculate the connection we vary this lagrangian with respect to the connection and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_\eta(\sqrt{-g}g^{\rho\sigma}) + b_1\partial_\eta(\sqrt{-g}g^{[\sigma\rho]}) + \delta_\eta^\sigma\partial_\nu(\sqrt{-g}g^{\rho\nu}) + 2a_1\delta_\eta^\rho\partial_\nu(\sqrt{-g}g^{[\sigma\nu]}) \\ & \frac{a_2}{2}\left(\delta_\eta^\sigma\partial_\nu(\sqrt{-g}g^{[\rho\nu]}) + \delta_\eta^\rho\partial_\nu(\sqrt{-g}g^{[\nu\sigma]})\right) \\ & + \sqrt{-g}\left\{-g^{\mu\sigma}W_{\mu\eta}^\rho - g^{\rho\nu}W_{\eta\nu}^\sigma + g^{\mu\nu}\delta_\eta^\sigma W_{\mu\nu}^\rho + g^{\rho\sigma}W_{\eta\lambda}^\lambda\right. \\ & + b_1\left(-g^{[\mu\sigma]}W_{\mu\eta}^\rho - g^{[\rho\nu]}W_{\eta\nu}^\sigma + g^{[\mu\nu]}\delta_\eta^\sigma W_{\mu\nu}^\rho + g^{[\rho\sigma]}W_{\eta\lambda}^\lambda\right) \\ & + \frac{b_2}{2}\left(g^{\mu\sigma}W_{[\mu\eta]}^\rho + g^{\rho\nu}W_{[\eta\nu]}^\sigma - g^{\sigma\nu}W_{[\eta\nu]}^\rho - g^{\mu\rho}W_{[\mu\eta]}^\sigma\right) \\ & + b_3\left(g^{[\rho\sigma]}W_\eta + \frac{1}{2}(\delta_\eta^\sigma g^{\mu\nu}W_{[\mu\nu]}^\rho - \delta_\eta^\rho g^{\mu\nu}W_{[\mu\nu]}^\sigma)\right) \\ & + \left[c_1\left(g^{\mu\rho}g^{\lambda\sigma}g_{\alpha\eta} + g^{\rho\mu}g^{\sigma\lambda}g_{\eta\alpha}\right) + 2c_2g^{\mu\lambda}g^{[\rho\sigma]}g_{(\alpha\eta)}\right. \\ & + \frac{c_3}{2}\left(g^{\mu\rho}g^{\sigma\lambda}g_{\alpha\eta} + g^{\rho\mu}g^{\lambda\sigma}g_{\eta\alpha} - g^{\mu\sigma}g^{\rho\lambda}g_{\alpha\eta} - g^{\sigma\mu}g^{\lambda\rho}g_{\eta\alpha}\right)\left. \right]W_{[\mu\lambda]}^\alpha \\ & \left. + d(g^{(\mu\rho)}\delta_\eta^\sigma - g^{(\mu\sigma)}\delta_\eta^\rho)W_\mu\right\} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

We contract this equation on ρ and η to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(2 + 8a_1 - \frac{3a_2}{2} + b_1\right) \partial_\rho (\sqrt{-g} g^{[\sigma\rho]}) + \sqrt{-g} \left\{ (b_2 + 2c_1 - c_3 - 3d) g^{(\mu\sigma)} W_\mu \right. \\ & + b_3 g^{[\rho\sigma]} W_\rho - \frac{3}{2} b_3 g^{\mu\nu} W_{[\mu\nu]}^\sigma + 2c_2 g^{\mu\nu} g^{[\rho\sigma]} g_{(\alpha\rho)} W_{[\mu\nu]}^\alpha \\ & \left. - \frac{c_3}{2} (g_{\alpha\rho} g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\rho\lambda} + g_{\rho\alpha} g^{\sigma\mu} g^{\lambda\rho}) W_{[\mu\lambda]}^\alpha \right\} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

and the contraction on σ and η gives

$$\begin{aligned} & 3\partial_\eta (\sqrt{-g} g^{(\rho\eta)}) + \left(3 + 2a_1 + \frac{3}{2}a_2 - b_1\right) \partial_\eta g^{[\rho\eta]} + \sqrt{-g} \left\{ 3g^{\mu\nu} W_{\mu\nu}^\rho + 2g^{\rho\eta} W_\eta \right. \\ & + \left(3b_1 + \frac{3}{2}b_3\right) g^{[\mu\nu]} W_{\mu\nu}^\rho + (2b_1 + b_3) g^{[\rho\eta]} W_\eta + \left(-b_2 + 2c_1 + c_3 + 3d\right) g^{(\nu\rho)} W_\nu \\ & \left. 2c_2 g^{[\mu\lambda]} g^{[\rho\eta]} g_{(\alpha\eta)} W_{\mu\lambda}^\alpha + \frac{c_3}{2} (g^{\mu\rho} g^{\eta\lambda} g_{\alpha\eta} + g^{\rho\mu} g^{\lambda\eta} g_{\eta\alpha}) W_{[\mu\lambda]}^\alpha \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

We only need to calculate the connection up to first order, since one can easily check that all second order contributions of the connection to the lagrangian (A8) can be written as a total derivative. From (A10) we find up to first order that

$$W_\mu = \Sigma \nabla^\rho B_{\mu\rho} \quad (\text{A12})$$

where we have defined

$$\Sigma \equiv -\frac{2 + 8a_1 - \frac{3}{2}a_2 + b_1}{b_2 - 2(c_1 + c_3) - 3d}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

In principle one could think that we have special cases if either the nominator or the denominator of (A13) is zero. This means that (on shell) either $W_\mu = 0$, or $\nabla^\rho B_{\mu\rho} = 0$. It turns out however, that in the linearized equations W_μ and $\nabla^\rho B_{\mu\rho}$ play exactly the same rôle. Therefore nothing special (in comparison to the case where $\Sigma \neq 0$) happens in the cases where one of them is zero. A case that *is* special is when both the nominator and the denominator of (A13) are zero. However in this case we cannot proceed with the calculation of the connection. We therefore assume that this is not the case. We redefine the connection as follows

$$W_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha - \frac{2}{3} \delta_\mu^\alpha W_\nu, \quad (\text{A14})$$

which means that $\Gamma_{[\mu\alpha]}^\alpha = 0$, and use (A10)) and (A11) to rewrite (A9). Terms that are clearly 2nd order or higher have been dropped.

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\partial_\eta g^{\rho\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\sigma}g_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\eta g^{\alpha\beta} - b_1\partial_\eta g^{[\rho\sigma]} + \frac{b_1}{2}g^{[\rho\sigma]}g_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\eta g^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\rho\sigma}\Gamma_{\eta\lambda}^\lambda - g^{\mu\sigma}\Gamma_{\mu\eta}^\rho - g^{\rho\mu}\Gamma_{\eta\mu}^\sigma \\
& + b_1\left(g^{[\rho\sigma]}\Gamma_{\eta\lambda}^\lambda - g^{[\mu\sigma]}\Gamma_{\mu\eta}^\rho - g^{[\rho\mu]}\Gamma_{\eta\mu}^\sigma\right) \\
& + b_2\left(g^{(\nu\sigma)}\Gamma_{[\nu\eta]}^\sigma + g^{(\rho\nu)}\Gamma_{[\eta\nu]}^\sigma\right) + 2(c_1 + c_3)g^{(\mu\rho)}g^{(\nu\sigma)}g_{(\alpha\eta)}\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\alpha \\
& + \mathbb{L}g^{(\rho\nu)}W_\nu\delta_\eta^\sigma + \mathbb{K}\left(\delta_\eta^\sigma g^{(\rho\nu)} - \delta_\eta^\rho g^{(\sigma\nu)}\right)W_\nu + \mathcal{O}(B^2) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{A15}$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{L} &\equiv \left(\frac{2}{3} + \frac{4}{3}a_1\right)\left(b_2 - 2(c_1 + c_3) - 3d\right)\left(2 + 8a_1 - \frac{3}{2}a_2 + b_1\right)^{-1} \\
\mathbb{K} &\equiv \left(2a_1 - \frac{1}{2}a_2\right)\left(b_2 - 2(c_1 + c_3) - 3d\right)\left(2 + 8a_1 - \frac{3}{2}a_2 + b_1\right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{3}b_2 + \frac{2}{3}(c_1 + c_3) + d.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we multiply (A15) with $g_{\rho\sigma}$ and substitute the resulting expression back in. For convenience we also multiply our equation with $g_{\rho\beta}g_{\alpha\sigma}$ and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_\eta g_{\alpha\beta} - g_{\rho\beta}\Gamma_{\alpha\eta}^\rho - g_{\alpha\sigma}\Gamma_{\eta\beta}^\sigma + b_1\nabla_\eta g_{[\alpha\beta]} \\
& - b_2\left(g_{(\rho\beta)}\Gamma_{\eta\alpha}^\rho + g_{(\alpha\sigma)}\Gamma_{[\beta\eta]}^\sigma\right) + 2(c_1 + c_3)g_{(\lambda\eta)}\Gamma_{[\beta\alpha]}^\lambda \\
& + \mathbb{L}W_\beta g_{\alpha\eta} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{L}g_{\alpha\beta}W_\eta + \mathbb{K}\left(g_{(\alpha\eta)}\delta_\beta^\nu - g_{(\eta\beta)}\delta_\alpha^\nu\right)W_\nu + \mathcal{O}(B^2) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{A16}$$

The zeroth order solution of this equation clearly gives the well known Levi-Civita connection:

$${}^{(0)}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \{\}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha. \tag{A17}$$

The first order equation can also be solved and gives

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^{(1)}\Gamma_{(\eta\beta)}^\rho &= \frac{\mathbb{L}}{4}\left(3G^{\lambda\rho}G_{\eta\beta}W_\lambda - \delta_\beta^\rho W_\eta - \delta_\eta^\rho W_\beta\right) \\
{}^{(1)}\Gamma_{[\eta\beta]}^\rho &= G^{\rho\zeta}\left(\phi\nabla_\beta B_{\eta\zeta} + \psi\nabla_\eta B_{\zeta\beta} + \xi\nabla_\zeta B_{\beta\eta}\right) + \theta\left(\delta_\beta^\rho W_\eta - \delta_\eta^\rho W_\beta\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{A18}$$

where the coefficients in the last expression are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi &= \psi \equiv \frac{(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B})(b_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{A}^2 + \mathcal{A}\mathcal{B} - 2\mathcal{B}^2} \\
\xi &\equiv \frac{(\mathcal{A} + 3\mathcal{B})(b_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{A}^2 + \mathcal{A}\mathcal{B} - 2\mathcal{B}^2} \\
\theta &\equiv \frac{2\mathbb{K} + \mathbb{L}}{\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}} \\
\mathcal{A} &\equiv 2(1 - b_2 + c_1 + c_3) \\
\mathcal{B} &\equiv -2(c_1 + c_3)
\end{aligned} \tag{A19}$$

2. Calculating the linearized lagrangian

Now that we now the connection, we can calculate the linearized version of the lagrangian (A8). It is clear that the zeroth order lagrangian is

$$^{(0)}\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-G}(R + 2\Lambda). \quad (\text{A20})$$

It is also not difficult to see that (A12) implies that

$$^{(1)}\mathcal{L} = 0. \quad (\text{A21})$$

for the quadratic order we find (all Γ 's refer from now on to the first order connection)

$$\begin{aligned} ^{(2)}\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-G} \Big\{ & \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho + 2\sigma \right) B^2 G^{\mu\nu} + (1 - \rho) B^{\mu\alpha} B_{\alpha}{}^{\nu} \right) R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} m^2 B^2 \\ & + G^{\mu\nu} \left(-\Gamma_{(\mu\lambda)}^{\sigma} \Gamma_{(\sigma\nu)}^{\lambda} + \Gamma_{(\mu\nu)}^{\sigma} \Gamma_{(\sigma\lambda)}^{\lambda} + (b_2 - 1) \Gamma_{[\mu\lambda]}^{\sigma} \Gamma_{[\sigma\nu]}^{\lambda} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (c_1 + c_3) G^{\lambda\delta} G_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{[\mu\lambda]}^{\alpha} \Gamma_{[\nu\delta]}^{\beta} + \left(d - \frac{1}{3} b_2 + \frac{2}{3} (c_1 + c_3) \right) W_{\mu} W_{\nu} \right) \\ & + B^{\mu\nu} \left((1 + b_1) \nabla_{\lambda} \Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^{\lambda} - \nabla_{\nu} \Gamma_{(\mu\lambda)}^{\lambda} + \left(-\frac{2}{3} - \frac{8}{3} a_1 + \frac{1}{2} a_2 - \frac{1}{3} b_1 \right) (\partial_{\mu} W_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu} W_{\mu}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + a_1 (\nabla_{\mu} \Gamma_{(\nu\lambda)}^{\lambda} - \nabla_{\nu} \Gamma_{(\mu\lambda)}^{\lambda}) \right) \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

where the mass for the B -field is given by

$$\frac{1}{4} m^2 = \Lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho + 4\sigma \right) \quad (\text{A23})$$

Plugging in the expressions we found for the connection (A18) and removing a total derivative term results in

$$\begin{aligned} ^{(2)}\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{-G} \Big\{ & \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho + 2\sigma \right) B^2 G^{\mu\nu} + (1 - \rho) B^{\mu\alpha} B_{\alpha}{}^{\nu} \right) R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} m^2 B^2 \\ & + \left(\Phi + \frac{1}{3} \Omega \right) H^2 + \Xi (\nabla^{\rho} B_{\mu\rho}) (\nabla^{\lambda} B_{\nu\lambda}) G^{\mu\nu} + \left(\Psi - 2\Omega \right) (\nabla^{\sigma} B^{\rho\nu}) (\nabla_{\rho} B_{\nu\sigma}) \Big\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\alpha\beta\gamma} &= \partial_\alpha B_{\beta\gamma} + \partial_\beta B_{\gamma\alpha} + \partial_\gamma B_{\alpha\beta} \\
\Phi &= \frac{1}{3}(\phi^2 + 2\xi\phi)(b_2 + c_1 + c_3 - 1) \\
\Xi &= 3\Sigma^2\theta^2(1 - b_2 + 2(c_1 + c_3)) + \Sigma^2\left(d - \frac{1}{3}b_2 + \frac{2}{3}(c_1 + c_3) - \frac{3}{8}\mathbb{L}^2\right) \\
&\quad + \Sigma\left(2\left(\theta + b_1\theta - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{8}{3}a_1 + \frac{1}{2}a_2 - \frac{1}{3}b_1 - \frac{\mathbb{L}}{2}(a_1 + \frac{1}{2})\right) - \theta(\phi - \xi)(4(c_1 + c_3) - 2b_2 + 2)\right) \\
\Psi &= (b_2 - 1)(\xi - \phi)^2 + 2\phi(1 + b_1) \\
\Omega &= (c_1 + c_3)(\xi - \phi)^2 + \xi(1 + b_1).
\end{aligned} \tag{A25}$$

van Nieuwenhuizen has proven a theorem [21], which states that in flat space the only consistent action for a massive antisymmetric tensor field is of the form

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{B flat}} = \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{12}H^2 + \frac{1}{4}m^2 B^2 \right). \tag{A26}$$

If we want to make sure that (A25) reduces to this form in flat space, the terms with the covariant derivatives have to be combined to a curvature tensor. This can be done with the following identity

$$(\nabla^\mu B^{\nu\beta})(\nabla_\beta B_{\mu\nu}) + (\nabla_\rho B^{\mu\rho})(\nabla^\sigma B_{\mu\sigma}) = -B^{\mu\alpha} B_\alpha{}^\nu R_{\mu\nu} - B^{\mu\nu} B^{\alpha\beta} R_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} + \text{total derivative} \tag{A27}$$

With this identity we find that the requirement (A26) is satisfied if

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi + \frac{1}{3}\Omega &= -\frac{1}{12} \\
\Xi &= \Psi - 2\Omega
\end{aligned} \tag{A28}$$

and then the lagrangian reduces to its final form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \sqrt{-G} \left[R + 2\Lambda - \frac{1}{12}H^2 + \left(\frac{1}{4}m^2 + \beta R \right) B^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \alpha R_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\alpha} B_\alpha{}^\nu - \gamma R_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} B^{\mu\nu} B^{\alpha\beta} \right] + \mathcal{O}(B^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{A29}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \rho + \Xi - 1 \\
\beta &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho + 2\sigma \right) \\
\gamma &= \Xi
\end{aligned} \tag{A30}$$

One can show that there is no choice for the parameters in the full lagrangian that has $\Xi = 0$ and simultaneously satisfies the constraints (A28) (what one finds is that if $\Xi = \Psi - 2\Omega = 0$, then automatically $\Phi + \frac{1}{3}\Omega = 0$). Therefore we conclude that it is not possible to get rid of the B -field coupling to the Riemann tensor. In other words, $\gamma = 0$ is not allowed within the theory.

APPENDIX B: GEOMETRIC QUANTITIES

We give an overview of the geometric quantities we use in the text. For the FRLW case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{^0_{00}\} &= \mathcal{H}, & \{^0_{ij}\} &= \mathcal{H}\delta_{ij}, & \{^j_{0i}\} &= \mathcal{H}\delta_i^j \\ R_{00} &= -3\mathcal{H}', & R_0^0 &= -\frac{3}{a^2}\mathcal{H}' \\ R_{ij} &= (\mathcal{H}' + 2\mathcal{H}^2)\delta_{ij}, & R_i^j &= -\frac{1}{a^2}(\mathcal{H}' + 2\mathcal{H}^2)\delta_i^j \\ R &= -\frac{6}{a^2}(\mathcal{H}^2 + \mathcal{H}'). \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

For the Schwarzschild case we have (the index a denotes 2,3):

$$\begin{aligned} R^0{}_{\mu}{}^1{}_{\nu} &= \delta_{\mu}^1 \delta_{\nu}^0 \frac{2M_s}{r^3} \\ R^0{}_{\mu}{}^a{}_{\nu} &= -\delta_{\mu}^a \delta_{\nu}^0 \frac{M_s}{r^3} \\ R^1{}_{\mu}{}^a{}_{\nu} &= -\delta_{\mu}^a \delta_{\nu}^1 \frac{M_s}{r^3} \\ R^2{}_{\mu}{}^3{}_{\nu} &= \delta_{\mu}^3 \delta_{\nu}^2 \frac{2M_s}{r^3} \end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

The terms of the form $R^{\lambda}{}_{\mu}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu}$ (no summation over λ) are symmetric in μ and ν and therefore they do not contribute to our equations.

-
- [1] C. M. Will, “The confrontation between general relativity and experiment,” [gr-qc/0510072](#).
 - [2] M. Milgrom, “A Modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis,” *Astrophys. J.* **270** (1983) 365–370.
 - [3] J. D. Bekenstein, “Relativistic gravitation theory for the MOND paradigm,” *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 083509, [astro-ph/0403694](#).
 - [4] J. W. Moffat, “Nonsymmetric gravitational theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **B355** (1995) 447–452, [gr-qc/9411006](#).

- [5] A. Einstein, “A generalization of the relativistic theory of gravitation.,” *Ann. Math.* **46** (1945) 578–584.
- [6] A. Einstein, “The Meaning of Relativity,” *Princeton University press* (1974).
- [7] L. Infeld *Acta. Phys. Pol.* **10** (1950) 284–293.
- [8] J. Callaway, “The Equations of Motion in Einstein’s New Unified Field Theory,” *Phys. Rev.* **92** (1953) 1576.
- [9] J. W. Moffat, “New Theory of Gravitation,” *Phys. Rev.* **D19** (1979) 3554.
- [10] J. W. Moffat, “Gravitational Theory, Galaxy Rotation Curves and Cosmology without Dark Matter,” *JCAP* **0505** (2005) 003, [astro-ph/0412195](#).
- [11] J. W. Moffat, “Modified gravitational theory as an alternative to dark energy and dark matter,” (2004) [astro-ph/0403266](#).
- [12] T. Prokopec and W. Valkenburg, “Nonsymmetric Metric Field as Dark Matter,” (2006).
- [13] M. Kalb and P. Ramond, “Classical direct interstring action,” *Phys. Rev.* **D9** (1974) 2273.
- [14] T. Damour, S. Deser, and J. G. McCarthy, “Nonsymmetric gravity theories: Inconsistencies and a cure,” *Phys. Rev.* **D47** (1993) 1541–1556, [gr-qc/9207003](#).
- [15] M. A. Clayton, “Massive NGT and spherically symmetric systems,” *J. Math. Phys.* **37** (1996) 395–420, [gr-qc/9505005](#).
- [16] M. A. Clayton, “Linearisation Instabilities of the Massive Nonsymmetric Gravitational Theory,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **13** (1996) 2851–2864, [gr-qc/9603062](#).
- [17] J. A. Isenberg and J. Nestor, “The effect of a gravitational interaction on classical fields: A Hamiltonian-Dirac analysis.,” *Ann. Phys.* **107** (1977) 56–81.
- [18] J. W. Moffat, “Dynamical Constraints in the Nonsymmetric Gravitational Theory,” [gr-qc/9605016](#).
- [19] T. Prokopec, “The cosmology of the nonsymmetric theory of gravitation,” [astro-ph/0503289](#).
- [20] A. H. Chamseddine, “Hermitian geometry and complex space-time,” [hep-th/0503048](#).
- [21] P. v. Nieuwenhuizen, “On ghost-free tensor Lagrangians and linearized gravitation.,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **60** (1973) 478–492.
- [22] Moffat’s theory has $a_1 = -1/2$, $a_2 = -2$, $h = -1/6$ and all other parameters zero [4]. A possible restriction on the parameters is ‘transposition invariance’: $g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow g_{\nu\mu}$, $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha \rightarrow \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^\alpha$, $W_\mu \rightarrow -W_\mu$. Einstein assumed that this symmetry would imply that matter and antimatter couple in the same way to gravity. Invariance under this symmetry fixes $a_1 = -1/2$